UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,494	10/14/2005	Jean-Jacques Aureglia	FR920030011US1	1532

30449 7590 02/17/2009

SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS
22 CENTURY HILL DRIVE
SUITE 302
LATHAM, NY 12110

EXAMINER	
RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
02/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/553,494	AUREGLIA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AMELIA RUTLEDGE	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 December 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *25-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *25 and 30-34* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *26-29* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *08 December 2008* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to: Amendment, filed 12/08/2008.

2. Claims 25-34 are pending. Claim 25 is an independent claim.

3. The objection to the drawings has been overcome by the replacement drawings filed on 12/08/2008, and by applicant's explanation of Fig. 17F, see Remarks, p. 8.

4. The objections to claims 25, 35, and 45 for minor informalities have been withdrawn.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Witkowski et al. ("Witkowski"), U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0059203 A1, published May 2002, in view of Hurst, et al. ("Hurst"), "Layout and Language: Preliminary investigations in recognizing the structure of tables", Proceedings of

the Fourth International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition, August 1997, Vol. 2, p. 1043-1047.

Regarding independent claim 25, Witkowski discloses *a method for creating a recursive scalable template instance (RSTI) in a multi-dimensional electronic data table having a first data table dimension (D1) and a second data table dimension (D2), said method implemented by execution of a computer program by a processor of a computer system,* because Witkowski discloses a method for performing spreadsheet like operations in a database system, and both spreadsheets and databases are multi-dimensional electronic data tables having rows and columns, i.e., first and second dimensions (par. 0018). Witkowski discloses performing recursive calculations on the spreadsheet cells using spreadsheet clauses, explained in detail at par. 0127-0139. Witkowski discloses defining the spreadsheet template at 0185-0190, and storing the template at par. 0191-0197. Witkowski discloses using the templates with the spreadsheet clause to apply rules in queries, at par. 0191-0197.

Witkowski also teaches that the spreadsheet template has extremely close syntax to that of the spreadsheet clause so that all the concepts of the spreadsheet clause apply to the templates (par. 0186).

Witkowski discloses *said method comprising: selecting a recursive scalable template (RST) associated with the RSTI such that the RSTI is to be structured in accordance with the RST*; because Witkowski discloses performing recursive calculations on the spreadsheet cells using spreadsheet clauses, explained in detail at par. 0127-0139. Witkowski discloses defining the spreadsheet template at 0187-0190,

and storing the template at par. 0191-0197. Witkowski discloses using the templates with the spreadsheet clause to apply rules in queries, at par. 0191-0197.

Witkowski suggests but does not explicitly teach *creating, in a memory of the computer system, a plurality of contiguous recursive element instances (REIs) of the RSTI, said REIs ordered and aligned along the dimension D1, at least two REIs having a different size along the dimension D1, each REI having a same size along the dimension D2*, because Witkowski teaches linking ordered cells of the rows and columns to template instances, but does not explicitly teach that the cells of the rows and/or columns have different sizes. Hurst is relied upon to teach linking ordered table cells to recursive scalable template instances (p. 1044; Sect. 3.2), where the cells have different sizes within the table rows and columns, for example different string length of a table area, or empty cells (p. 1045, Sect. 3.3); Hurst teaches classifying layout patterns in the tables (p. 1043, Sect. 2.1).

Witkowski discloses *each REI comprising at least one scalable template instance (STI), said creating comprising structuring each REI according to a recursive element (RE) defined for the RST such that the RE includes at least one scalable template (ST), said creating comprising instancing each ST of the RE to generate an associated scalable template instance (STI) of an REI of the plurality of REIs*; because Witkowski discloses performing recursive calculations on the spreadsheet cells using spreadsheet clauses, explained in detail at par. 0127-0139. Witkowski discloses defining the spreadsheet template at 0185-0190, and storing the template at par. 0191-0197.

Witkowski discloses using the templates with the spreadsheet clause to apply rules in queries, at par. 0191-0197.

Witkowski teaches *aligning a first dimension and a second dimension of each STI of each REI along the dimension D1 and along the dimension D2*, respectively, because Witkowski teaches aligning cells in rows and columns, i.e., the dimension D1 and D2 (Fig. 1, Fig. 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the method of analyzing table data layout using recursive templates, disclosed by Hurst, to the method for performing spreadsheet like operations in a database system disclosed by Witkowski, since both Witkowski and Hurst were directed to analyzing and manipulating relational structure of tables using templates, it would have been obvious and desirable to combine the disclosed known prior art methods (recursive templates; table data analysis; spreadsheet operations) in order to achieve predictable results (also see Hurst, p. 0146-47; Sect. 6.2).

Regarding dependent claim 30, Witkowski teaches *wherein the method comprises: determining whether the RSTI being created would corrupt an existing RSTI in the data table*, because Witkowski teaches that duplicate rules are removed (par. 0197),

Regarding dependent claim 31, Witkowski teaches *wherein the multidimensional electronic data table is an electronic spreadsheet having a plurality of dimensions and comprising a plurality of cells identified by a cell address along each dimension of the plurality of dimensions, and wherein the plurality of dimensions*

comprises the dimension D1 and the dimension D2, since Witkowski discloses a method for performing spreadsheet like operations in a database system, and both spreadsheets and databases are multi-dimensional electronic data tables having rows and columns, i.e., first and second dimensions (par. 0018).

Regarding dependent claim 32, Witkowski does not explicitly teach *wherein each STI associated with an ST of the RE of the RST comprises contiguous elements of a same size ordered and aligned along the dimension D1 or D2,*

wherein each ST is defined as a range of cells, wherein the method comprises: specifying for each ST of the RE, an element format (EF) and/or an element profile (EP), said EF defining for each cell within each element of each ST at least one format attribute, said EP defining a cell content for each cell within each element of each ST; and structuring each element of the contiguous elements of each STI according to the EF and/or EP specified in each associated ST of the RE, however, Hurst teaches linking ordered table cells to recursive scalable template instances (p. 1044; Sect. 3.2), where the cells have different sizes within the table rows and columns, as well ad different contiguous areas, for example different string length of a table area, or empty cells (p. 1045, Sect. 3.3); Hurst teaches classifying layout patterns in the tables (p. 1043, Sect. 2.1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the method of analyzing table data layout using recursive templates, disclosed by Hurst, to the method for performing spreadsheet like operations in a database system disclosed by Witkowski, since both Witkowski and Hurst were directed

to analyzing and manipulating relational structure of tables using templates, it would have been obvious and desirable to combine the disclosed known prior art methods (recursive templates; table data analysis; spreadsheet operations) in order to achieve predictable results (also see Hurst, p. 0146-47; Sect. 6.2).

Regarding dependent claim 33, Witkowski teaches *an element profile defining a cell destination for each cell within each element of the first ST, said cell destination specifying whether the cell is an input cell for receiving an entry or an output cell for producing a result*, because Witkowski teaches using the template to apply update rules, and also teaches designating cells for a query to perform spreadsheet operations (par. 0068-0078); Witkowski also teaches that the spreadsheet template has extremely close syntax to that of the spreadsheet clause so that all the concepts of the spreadsheet clause apply to the templates (par. 0186).

Regarding dependent claim 34, Witkowski teaches *wherein the at least one format attribute is selected from the group consisting of at least one background attribute, at least one alignment attribute, at least one font attribute, at least one line attribute, at least one protection attribute, and combinations thereof*, because Witkowski teaches shorthands for positional referencing, automatic dependency ordering (par. 0021-0025), and conditions including row and column (par. 0041-0047).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 26 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 27-29 depend from claim 26 and therefore incorporate the limitations of claim 26, which would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Clancey et al.	**U.S. Patent No. 6,292,811 B1**	**issued**	**September 2001**
Rao et al.	**U.S. Patent No. 5,880,742**	**issued**	**March 1999**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AMELIA RUTLEDGE whose telephone number is (571)272-7508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Amelia Rutledge/
Examiner, Art Unit 2176